2:05-cv-74587-GCS-DAS Doc # 8 Filed 01/20/06 Pg 1 of 2 Pg ID 19

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

CHAUNCY HARRISON,

	Plaintiff,	CIVIL ACTION NO. 05-CV-74587-DT
V.		DISTRICT JUDGE GEORGE CARAM STEEH

MAGISTRATE JUDGE DONALD A. SCHEER

OFFICER RUSSELL, and OFFICER GARNER,

Defendants	
	/

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

This cause comes before the Court on Petitioner's Motion For Appointment of Counsel dated December 5, 2005 (Docket #3). The decision to appoint counsel for an indigent litigant is within the discretion of the district court. <u>LaBeau v. Dakota</u>, 815 F.Supp. 1074, 1076 (W.D. Mich. 1993) (citing Henry v. City of Detroit Manpower Dept., 763 F.2d 757, 760 (6th Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 474 U.S. 1036 (1985)). Appointment of counsel is not a constitutional right. <u>Childs v. Pellegrin</u>, 822 F.2d 1382, 1384 (6th Cir. 1987). This discretion rests upon a consideration of all the circumstances of the case, including the plaintiff's finances, his efforts to obtain counsel, and most importantly, whether the plaintiff's case appears to be meritorious. <u>Henry</u> at 760.

Except in rare circumstances, it is the practice of this Court to attempt to obtain counsel in civil rights cases filed by prison inmates, but only after a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment has been denied. Since the defendants have not yet been served, and no answer has been filed to the complaint, I do not believe it necessary or appropriate to appoint counsel at this time. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motions for Appointment of Counsel is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

2:05-cv-74587-GCS-DAS Doc # 8 Filed 01/20/06 Pg 2 of 2 Pg ID 20

The parties to this action may object to and seek review of this Order but are

required to act within ten (10) days of service of a copy hereof as provided for in

Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(a) and E.D.Mich.LR 72.1(d)(1). Failure to file specific objections

constitutes a waiver of any further right of appeal. Fed.R.Civ.P. 72. Filing of objections

that raise some issues but fail to raise others with specificity, will not preserve all the

objections a party might have to this Order. Pursuant to E.D. Mich. LR 72.1(d)(1), a copy

of any objection is to be served upon this Magistrate Judge.

Within ten (10) days of service of any objecting party's timely filed objections, the

opposing party may file a response. The response shall not be more than five (5) pages

in length unless by motion and order such page limit is extended by the Court. The

response shall address specifically, and in the same order raised, each issue contained

within the objections.

SO ORDERED.

s/Donald A. Scheer DONALD A. SCHEER UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: January 20, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify on January 20, 2006 that I electronically filed the foregoing paper with the Clerk of the Court sending notification of such filing to all counsel registered electronically. I hereby certify that a copy of this paper was mailed to the following non-

registered ECF participants on January 20, 2006. Chauncy Harrison.

s/Michael E. Lang

Deputy Clerk to

Magistrate Judge Donald A. Scheer

(313) 234-5217

2